

MEAN FIELD RENORMALIZATION GROUP FOR THE BOUNDARY MAGNETIZATION OF STRIP CLUSTERS

Alessandro Pelizzola^a and Attilio Stella^b

^aDipartimento di Fisica, Politecnico di Torino, I-10129 Torino, Italy

^bDipartimento di Fisica, Università di Bologna, I-40126 Bologna, Italy

ABSTRACT

We analyze in some detail a recently proposed transfer matrix mean field approximation which yields the exact critical point for several two dimensional nearest neighbor Ising models. For the square lattice model we show explicitly that this approximation yields not only the exact critical point, but also the exact boundary magnetization of a semi-infinite Ising model, independent of the size of the strips used. Then we develop a new mean field renormalization group strategy based on this approximation and make connections with finite size scaling. Applying our strategy to the quadratic Ising and three-state Potts models we obtain results for the critical exponents which are in excellent agreement with the exact ones. In this way we also clarify some advantages and limitations of the mean field renormalization group approach.

1. Introduction

A recently proposed[1] transfer matrix version of a mean field approximation (which in the following will be denoted by LS) applied to several nearest neighbor Ising models in two dimensions, gave surprisingly exact results for the critical points, even without extrapolation, and very good results, under extrapolation, for more complicated models.

A first issue to address in connection with the LS approximation is why the results are exact in the n.n. Ising case and extrapolate accurately in the others, and whether extra exact results can be obtained by this scheme.

We want also to clarify what is the connection of this method with other techniques of more common use in two dimensional statistical mechanics. In particular:

- a) since the method involves consideration of strips similar to those used, e.g., in finite size scaling (FSS) and phenomenological renormalization approaches[2], it is legitimate to ask up to which extent the LS approximation is connected to these approaches and possibly fits within them;
- b) since the method uses as a basic ingredient effective fields on the boundary of the strips, it is also rather natural to look for connections with the so-called mean field renormalization group[3] (MFRG) approach. This will go together with showing how critical exponents can be obtained in this context.

The plan of the paper is as follows: in Sec. 2 we give a brief review of the LS approximation and show, in the square lattice Ising case, that it gives not only the exact critical point, but also the exact boundary magnetization of a semi-infinite Ising model, independent of the size of the strips used; in Sec. 3 we show how the LS approximation fits into a MFRG structure, develop a procedure for calculating the critical exponents, and compare the method with the FSS approach; in Sec. 4 we give two test applications of the procedure above, on the two dimensional Ising and three-state Potts models. Finally, in Sec. 5, we draw some conclusions.

2. The LS Approximation

The LS approximation scheme[1] makes use of two infinite strips $\mathcal{S}_n$ and $\mathcal{S}_{n'}$ of widths n and n' respectively, with periodic boundary conditions along the infinite direction. The approximation is obtained by applying an effective field h_{eff} at *one side* of the strips and by imposing the consistency relation

$$m_{1n}(K, h_{eff}) = m_{1n'}(K, h_{eff}), \quad (1)$$

where m_{1n} and $m_{1n'}$ are the values of the order parameter at *the opposite side* of the strips and $K = \beta J > 0$ is the exchange interaction strength. Eq. (1) has to be solved for h_{eff} at fixed K and the critical temperature is the one for which the paramagnetic solution $h_{eff} = 0$ bifurcates into nonzero solutions, leading to spontaneous magnetization.

This method, as pointed out by Lipowski and Suzuki[1], yields the exact critical temperature of the Ising model with nearest-neighbor interaction on many two dimensional lattices (square, triangular, honeycomb and centered square), and very accurate estimates of the critical temperature of more complicated models (Ising model with alternating strength of interaction, with next-nearest-neighbor interaction, $S \geq 1$ models).

In the present section we will show, resorting to a result by Au-Yang and Fisher[4], that at least in the simplest case of the nearest-neighbor Ising model on the square lattice the LS approximation yields not only the exact critical temperature, but also the *exact boundary magnetization* of the semi-infinite model.

Let us consider an Ising model on a strip $\mathcal{S}_n$ of a square lattice, number from 1 to n the chains which form the strip and apply a magnetic field h_n on the n th chain. The corresponding hamiltonian will be

$$-\beta H = K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{+\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (s_{i,j} s_{i+1,j} + s_{i,j} s_{i,j+1}) + K \sum_{i=-\infty}^{+\infty} s_{i,n} s_{i+1,n} + h_n \sum_{i=-\infty}^{+\infty} s_{i,n}, \quad (2)$$

where $s_{i,j} = \pm 1$ is an Ising spin located at the site with coordinates i and j in the x and y direction respectively. The magnetization $m_{1n} \equiv m_{1n}(K, h_n) =$

$\langle s_{i,1} \rangle$ has been calculated for $n \geq 2$ by Fisher and Au–Yang in ref. [4], and is given by

$$m_{1n}(K, h_n) = z' \left(\frac{\tilde{c}_+}{\tilde{c}_-} \right)^{1/2} \left[\frac{|\tilde{t}| - \tilde{t} \tanh(2n \sinh^{-1}|t'|)}{|\tilde{t}| + (\tilde{t} + \tilde{c}_+ z'^2) \tanh(2n \sinh^{-1}|t'|)} \right]^{1/2}. \quad (3)$$

In eq. (3) we have adopted the same notation of ref. [4], i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} z' &= \tanh h_n, \\ t' &= \frac{1 - \sinh 2K}{(2 \sinh 2K)^{1/2}}, \quad \tilde{t} = t'(1 + t'^2)^{1/2} = \frac{1}{2}(\coth 2K - \cosh 2K), \\ \tilde{c}_{\pm} &= (2 + t'^2)^{1/2}(1 + t'^2)^{1/2} - \tilde{t} \pm 1 = \cosh 2K \pm 1. \end{aligned}$$

For $K > K_c = \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 + \sqrt{2})$ it is easily realised that if h_n is chosen in such a way that $\tilde{t} + \tilde{c}_+ z'^2 = -\tilde{t}$, i.e.

$$z' = \tanh h_n = \left(\frac{\cosh 2K - \coth 2K}{\cosh 2K + 1} \right)^{1/2} \quad (4)$$

then the quantity in square brackets in eq. (3) equals 1, independent of n , and one has

$$m_{1n}(K, h_n) \equiv m_1(K) = \left(\frac{\cosh 2K - \coth 2K}{\cosh 2K - 1} \right)^{1/2} \quad (5)$$

where $m_1(K)$ is the *exact boundary magnetization* of the two dimensional semi-infinite Ising model[5]. Furthermore, for $K < K_c$, choosing $h_n = 0$ yields $m_1(K) = 0$, again independent on n .

The case $n = 1$, for which eq. (3) is no more valid, can be easily solved by the transfer matrix method, obtaining

$$m_{11}(K, h_1) = \frac{\sinh h_1}{(\sinh^2 h_1 + e^{-4K})^{1/2}}, \quad (6)$$

which again equals $m_1(K)$ if h_1 is chosen according to eq. (4).

These results imply that, no matter which n, n' we choose, the bifurcation at $h_{eff} = 0$ will always occur at the exact critical point, $K = K_c$. This mechanism is at the basis of the results of ref. [1] for the square lattice case,

and we believe that the same should work for the other two dimensional lattices.

Finally, if, fully in the spirit of a classical approach, we consider the nonzero magnetization solution in eq. (1) for $K > K_c$, by putting $h_{eff} = h_n$ we obtain the exact spontaneous boundary magnetization m_1 , independent of n, n' . This was not noticed in ref. [1].

The following remarks are in order for an explanation of the above results. First of all, the boundary magnetization is known to behave as $m_1(K) \approx (K - K_c)^{\beta_1}$ for $K \rightarrow K_c^+$ with $\beta_1 = 1/2$, in the $2d$ Ising model. The exponent $\beta_1 = 1/2$ [5] is such that it can be reproduced exactly by a mean field like approximation, making use of an effective field. When considering models with β_1 values incompatible with a classical scheme, one has to consider the LS approach and its possible extensions and approximations, as we will discuss in the next sections.

As shown in ref. [6], in the context of a generalized cluster variation approach to two dimensional lattice models, the double strip $\mathcal{S}_2$ is able to contain the whole information needed to solve exactly the two dimensional n.n. Ising model. The problem then reduces to how such information can be extracted. Clearly what we presented in this section amounts to a relatively simple way of obtaining part of this information.

3. Mean field renormalization group and finite size scaling

Let us now see how the LS approximation can be used to develop a new MFRG strategy, where the boundary magnetization is used together with the bulk one as an effective scaling operator. This will also be useful in understanding the relations of the LS method with FSS.

The notation applies to an Ising model for convenience, but the strategy is not limited to this case, as will be shown in the next section where it will be used to investigate the three-state Potts model.

For infinite Ising strips of widths n and n' , FSS implies the following scaling law for the singular part of the bulk free energy density, $f^{(b)}$,

$$f_{n'}^{(b)}(\ell^{y_T} \epsilon, \ell^{y_H} h) = \ell^d f_n^{(b)}(\epsilon, h), \quad (7)$$

where $\epsilon = (T_c - T)/T_c$, $\ell = n/n'$ is the rescaling factor, and d is the bulk dimension. If the boundary conditions are open, for the singular part of the surface free energy density, $f^{(s)}$, the relation

$$f_{n'}^{(s)}(\ell^{y_T} \epsilon, \ell^{y_H} h, \ell^{y_{HS}} b) = \ell^{d-1} f_n^{(s)}(\epsilon, h, b), \quad (8)$$

holds, where b indicates a surface field.

The MFRG basic idea[3] is to derive from eq. (7) the scaling relation for the bulk magnetization

$$m_{n'}(K', h') = \ell^{d-y_H} m_n(K, h), \quad (9)$$

where $h' = \ell^{y_H} h$ and $K' \equiv K'(K)$ is a mapping in the Wilson–Kadanoff sense, determined implicitly, in the limit of h going to zero, on the basis of eq. (9). From this mapping the critical point K_c and the thermal exponent y_T can be obtained by means of the relations $K_c = K'(K_c)$ and $\ell^{y_T} = \frac{\partial K'}{\partial K}(K = K_c)$.

Applying this idea to the surface magnetization yields

$$m_{1n'}(K', h', b') = \ell^{d-1-y_{HS}} m_{1n}(K, h, b), \quad (10)$$

where $b' = \ell^{y_{HS}} b$ if we want b to scale as a surface field. On the other hand, the equation for the critical point which is characteristic of the LS approximation would be recovered if b scaled as a magnetization, i.e. with an exponent $d - 1 - y_{HS}$. In fact, with this assumption, setting $h = 0$ and linearizing in b yields

$$\frac{\partial m_{1n'}}{\partial b'}(K', 0, 0) = \frac{\partial m_{1n}}{\partial b}(K, 0, 0), \quad (11)$$

which implicitly defines a mapping $K'(K)$. The equation

$$K_c = K'(K_c) \quad (12)$$

with $K'(K)$ given by eq. (11) is equivalent to the equation for the critical point in the LS approximation. So this approximation can also be seen as a realization of a MFRG strategy as far as determination of K_c is concerned.

In a MFRG spirit one can also determine the critical exponents, since y_T is obtained by the relation

$$\ell^{y_T} = \left. \frac{\partial K'}{\partial K} \right|_{K=K_c}, \quad (13)$$

linearizing eq. (9) with respect to h , with $K = K_c$ yields

$$\frac{\partial m_{n'}}{\partial h'}(K_c, 0) = \ell^{d-2y_H} \frac{\partial m_n}{\partial h}(K_c, 0), \quad (14)$$

from which y_H can be obtained and finally, linearizing eq. (10) in the same way, with $b = 0$, yields

$$\frac{\partial m_{1n'}}{\partial h'}(K_c, 0, 0) = \ell^{d-1-y_{HS}-y_H} \frac{\partial m_{1n}}{\partial h}(K_c, 0, 0), \quad (15)$$

from which y_{HS} is obtained.

The set of equations (11)–(15) is a MFRG procedure to determine critical point and critical exponents.

Nevertheless, the procedure above (to be denoted by M, for "magnetization", in the following) is not a rigorous application of FSS. In such an application (11) should be replaced by

$$\frac{\partial m_{1n'}}{\partial b'}(K', 0, 0) = \ell^{d-1-2y_{HS}} \frac{\partial m_{1n}}{\partial b}(K, 0, 0), \quad (16)$$

since b should scale as a field, with exponent y_{HS} , and should be solved in conjunction with (14)–(15). This alternative and more rigorous procedure will be denoted by F, for "field", in the following.

F is in fact the procedure of MFRG proposed in ref. [3] to yield simultaneously bulk and surface exponents. It is interesting to investigate how M, proposed here, being more consistent with the effective field idea, compares with F.

Two comments are in order:

- i) the two procedures should give the same value of K_c (but not of the exponents) in the limit $n, n' \rightarrow \infty$, $\ell \rightarrow 1$, since the two derivatives in eq. (11) are analytic functions; this should justify the LS approximation in a FSS context;

- ii) in the two dimensional n.n. Ising case, $y_{HS} = 1/2$ exactly and then, in the limit above, also the critical exponents should be the same for both procedures M and F.

In the following section we will check these ideas on the two dimensional n.n. Ising and three-state Potts cases.

4. Results and discussion

In the present section we give two test applications of our new MFRG strategy (M), to the Ising and three-state Potts models on square lattices. We also compare our results with those obtained treating b as a surface field, i.e. letting it scale with exponent y_{HS} . We start by applying procedure M to the Ising model. In the Ising case, we have already shown that the method gives the exact critical point for any n, n' . Furthermore, resorting to eq. (3), the mapping $K' = K'(K)$ can be determined analytically in an implicit form. As a result one gets

$$f_{n'}(K') = f_n(K), \quad (17)$$

where

$$f_n(K) = K \coth K \left[\frac{1 + \tanh(2n \sinh^{-1}|t'|)}{1 - \tanh(2n \sinh^{-1}|t'|)} \right]^{1/2} \quad (18)$$

and with t' as above. It can be checked that the fixed point of (17), obtained by setting $t' = 0$, is $K^* = \frac{1}{2} \ln(1 + \sqrt{2})$, while for the thermal exponent one has

$$\ell^{y_T} = \frac{1 + 2(2n - 1)K^*}{1 + 2(2n' - 1)K^*}, \quad (19)$$

which, in the limit $n, n' \rightarrow \infty$, yields $y_T = 1$, which is again an exact result.

The calculation of the magnetic exponents cannot be carried out analytically since no solution is available for the bulk magnetization of a strip in the presence of a bulk magnetic field, and we have to proceed numerically, as follows. Given the strip $\mathcal{S}_n$ with a bulk magnetic field h and an auxiliary magnetic field h_1 acting on the first chain, we determine its partition function $Z_n(K, h, h_1)$ as the largest eigenvalue of the $2^n \times 2^n$ transfer matrix with

elements

$$T_n(\{s_j\}, \{s'_j\}) = \exp \left[\frac{K}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (s_j s_{j+1} + s'_j s'_{j+1}) + K \sum_{j=1}^n s_j s'_j + \frac{h}{2} \sum_{j=1}^n (s_j + s'_j) + \frac{h_1}{2} (s_1 + s'_1) \right]. \quad (20)$$

The bulk and boundary magnetizations will then be given by

$$m_n \equiv m_n(K, h) = \frac{1}{Z_n} \frac{\partial Z_n}{\partial h} \Big|_{h_1=0} \quad (21)$$

and

$$m_{1n} \equiv m_{1n}(K, h) = \frac{1}{Z_n} \frac{\partial Z_n}{\partial h_1} \Big|_{h_1=0} \quad (22)$$

respectively. Finally y_H and y_{HS} are determined according to (14)–(15).

In Tab. 1 we report the results for the critical exponents for strip widths $2 \leq n = n' + 1 \leq 8$ ($n = n' + 1$ is always the most convenient choice). The extrapolations are based on least squares fits with fourth order polynomials in $1/n$ and are certainly justified since the critical exponents are nearly linear functions of $1/n$. The agreement of the extrapolated data with the exact results is very good, and the errors are within 0.2%.

The Ising test has yielded very promising results, but does not shed much light on the physical meaning of the effective parameter b , since for the two dimensional Ising model surface magnetization and surface field scale with the same exponent $d - 1 - y_{HS} = y_{HS} = 1/2$. In fact, procedure F, in which b scales as a surface field yields as well very good results (apart from having no solution when $n = 2$), as shown in Tab. 2. Data from the two procedures are plotted together in Figs. 1–4. As expected, all the results seem to be equivalent in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In view of the above considerations, we believe that a more conclusive test is in order, and a suitable model should be the three-state Potts model. Indeed, in two dimensions, this model is known to undergo a second order phase transition, whose critical point and critical exponents are known exactly [7,8], even in the absence of a full solution. In particular it has $y_{HS} \neq 1/2$.

The hamiltonian of the q -state Potts model[7] is

$$-\beta H = \frac{K}{q-1} \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} (q\delta_{s_i, s_j} - 1) + \frac{h}{q-1} \sum_i (q\delta_{s_i, 0} - 1), \quad (23)$$

where the variables s_i take on values $0, 1, \dots, q-1$, $K > 0$ is the interaction strength and h is a magnetic field. The order parameter of the model, corresponding to the Ising magnetization, is

$$m = \frac{q\langle\delta_{s_i, 0}\rangle - 1}{q-1}. \quad (24)$$

In the case $q = 2$ one recovers the Ising model.

The MFRG scheme developed above can be carried over to the q -state Potts model without any substantial modification, and we will apply it to the case $q = 3$. The main new fact is that no analytical results like eq. (3) are available for the three-state Potts model. So all calculations must be performed numerically with the transfer matrix method. The order of the transfer matrix is now 3^n and increases more rapidly than in the Ising case. However, the transfer matrix is invariant with respect to the transformation which interchanges the states $s_i = 1$ and $s_i = 2$ (all other symmetries are lost as soon as one introduces the surface fields), and the eigenvector corresponding to its largest eigenvalue belongs to the symmetric subspace of this transformation. Thus we can limit ourselves to matrices acting in this subspace, which are of order $(3^n + 1)/2$. In this way we have been able to deal with strips up to $n = 7$.

The numerical results for procedure M are reported in Tab. 3. The extrapolation is obtained by fitting data in a least square sense with a second order polynomial in $1/n$. Even if now the critical point is not given exactly by the LS approximation, we obtain excellent agreement with the exact results (error within 2.3%) for the bulk critical point and exponents, while, in comparison, the results for the surface exponent y_{HS} are rather poor.

In Tab. 4 we report the results obtained from procedure F. The situation is very similar to the previous one: the errors of the extrapolated critical point and bulk exponents are within 4.7% and, in comparison, the estimate

of the surface exponent is again rather poor. Results from the two procedures are plotted together in Figs. 5–8.

There is some evidence that F is the correct procedure when n is large, but for small strips M, although not rigorous, seems to work very well: indeed if y_H had been extrapolated on the basis of the results for $2 \leq n \leq 5$ one would have obtained 1.868, which is two orders of magnitude more accurate than the extrapolation on the whole set of data.

5. Conclusions

We have analyzed in some detail the LS approximation, showing that in the two dimensional n.n. Ising case, it yields not only the exact critical point, but also the exact boundary magnetization of the semi-infinite model, independent of the size of the strips used. We have also proposed an explanation of these surprising results.

The LS approximation has been used to develop a new MFRG strategy (procedure M) which yielded very accurate results for the critical exponents of the Ising and three-state Potts models in two dimensions. When compared with rigorous FSS (procedure F) our new strategy has proven to be particularly suitable for applications where relatively small strips are used.

References

- [1] A. Lipowski and M. Suzuki, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **61** (1992) 4356.
- [2] M.N. Barber, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, edited by C. Domb and J.L. Lebowitz (Academic, London, 1983), vol. 8.
- [3] J.O. Indekeu, A. Maritan and A.L. Stella, Phys. Rev. B **35** (1987) 305; for a review see K. Croes and J.O. Indekeu, preprint Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (1993).
- [4] H. Au-Yang and M.E. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **21** (1980) 3956 (here our eq. (3) is reported with a misprint).
- [5] B.M. McCoy and T.T. Wu, *The Two-Dimensional Ising Model* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1973), Chap. 6.
- [6] A.G. Schlijper, J. Stat. Phys. **35** (1984) 285.
- [7] F.Y. Wu, Rev. Mod. Phys. **54** (1982) 235.
- [8] J.L. Cardy, Nucl. Phys. B **240** (1984) 514.

Figure Captions

- Fig. 1 : The Ising critical point K_c vs. $1/n$ as given by the M (solid line) and F (dashed line) procedures.
- Fig. 2 : The Ising thermal exponent y_T vs. $1/n$ as given by the M (solid line) and F (dashed line) procedures.
- Fig. 3 : The Ising magnetic exponent y_H vs. $1/n$ as given by the M (solid line) and F (dashed line) procedures.
- Fig. 4 : The Ising surface magnetic exponent y_{HS} vs. $1/n$ as given by the M (solid line) and F (dashed line) procedures.
- Fig. 5 : The three-state Potts critical point K_c vs. $1/n$ as given by the M (solid line) and F (dashed line) procedures.
- Fig. 6 : The three-state Potts thermal exponent y_T vs. $1/n$ as given by the M (solid line) and F (dashed line) procedures.
- Fig. 7 : The three-state Potts magnetic exponent y_H vs. $1/n$ as given by the M (solid line) and F (dashed line) procedures.
- Fig. 8 : The three-state Potts surface magnetic exponent y_{HS} vs. $1/n$ as given by the M (solid line) and F (dashed line) procedures.

Tab. 1: results for the Ising model ($b = \text{magnetization}$)

n	y_T	y_H	y_{HS}
2	0.95738	1.60287	0.60287
3	0.97310	1.68092	0.56808
4	0.98089	1.72197	0.55099
5	0.98514	1.74793	0.54067
6	0.98785	1.76600	0.53374
7	0.98969	1.77937	0.52873
8	0.99106	1.78970	0.52496
Extrap	0.99977	1.87201	0.49764
Exact	1	1.875	0.5

Tab. 2: results for the Ising model ($b = \text{field}$)

n	K_c	y_T	y_H	y_{HS}
3	0.52903	0.96548	1.99012	0.91150
4	0.48065	0.97840	1.91195	0.77040
5	0.46366	0.98404	1.88570	0.70267
6	0.45560	0.98726	1.87397	0.66195
7	0.45113	0.98938	1.86794	0.63455
8	0.44839	0.99086	1.86461	0.61482
Extrap	0.44512	0.99858	1.87440	0.49865
Exact	0.44069	1	1.875	0.5

Tab. 3: results for the 3--state Potts model ($b =$ magnetization)

n	K_c	y_T	y_H	y_{HS}
2	0.71318	1.10152	1.60916	0.60916
3	0.69762	1.12118	1.69079	0.56966
4	0.69013	1.13209	1.73652	0.54785
5	0.68574	1.13978	1.76704	0.53350
6	0.68287	1.14496	1.78923	0.52317
7	0.68084	1.14993	1.80629	0.51526
Extrap	0.66896	1.17561	1.90880	0.47250
Exact	0.67004	1.2	1.86667	0.33333

Tab. 4: results for the 3--state Potts model ($b =$ field)

n	K_c	y_T	y_H	y_{HS}
3	0.78999	1.12871	1.96588	0.87340
4	0.72612	1.14060	1.88767	0.72035
5	0.70302	1.14627	1.86166	0.64290
6	0.69184	1.15025	1.85030	0.59417
7	0.68555	1.15541	1.84477	0.56018
Extrap	0.70167	1.17551	1.88526	0.40703
Exact	0.67004	1.2	1.86667	0.33333